

least one pattern of the gaming board and at least a part of the gaming board behind which the display is disposed has transparency.

In a non-limiting example, page 6, paragraph 6 describes a sheet painted with some illustrations, symbols, or the like, pasted on a part of the reverse face of the gaming board 14 (see, e.g., Figure 1). Thus, no new matter is added. It should be emphasized that Claim 1 describes “the display unit disposed on a reverse face of the gaming board”, which means “the display unit” is in direct contact with “a reverse face” of “the gaming board”. The language “in direct contact with” in the claim corresponds with the expression “on a reverse face of”.

Yamaguchi, on the other hand, describes a game board 3 and a variable display unit 2 that are not disposed in direct contact with each other. This is apparent from Figure 2 of Yamaguchi. Moreover, Yamaguchi offers no teaching, suggestion or motivation for disposing the game board 3 and the variable display unit 2 in direct contact. Furthermore, the Office Action does not assert any references that disclose this feature, which is absent in Yamaguchi.

Interestingly, Yamaguchi also describes that “the removable game board 3 is installed in front of the liquid crystal display (i.e. the variable display unit 2)” (column 4, lines 11-15). “A winning ball guide 9 is arranged on the back (i.e. on the back of the game board 3)” (column 4, lines 23-24). Thus, the description in Yamaguchi actually teaches away from the claimed feature of “the display unit is disposed on a reverse face of the gaming board” because the ball guide 9 is arranged on the back.

In order to present a *prima facie* case of obviousness, Yamaguchi would be required to disclose, teach or suggest either individually or in combination with the secondary reference, all of the elements of Claim 1. However, as discussed above, Yamaguchi fails to teach or suggest the “display unit is disposed on a reverse face of the gaming board” as

claimed. Likewise no secondary reference is asserted to cure the deficiency with regard to Yamaguchi.

As each of Claims 2-7 depend from Claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims also patentably define over Yamaguchi. Because the rejection fails to cite prior art having all of the elements in the claim, the present Official Action fails to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Consequently, in view of the present discussion it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 1-7 is patentably distinguishing over the prior art. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of this rejection is therefore requested.


Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

BDL\la
I:\ATTY\BDL\244255US-RESPONSE.DOC